DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 395 CS 206 969

AUTHOR Witte, Stephen P.; And Others
TITLE The Goals of Freshman Writing Programs as Perceived by a National Sample of College and University Writing Program Directors and Teachers. Technical Report No. 5.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 31 Jan 82
GRANT G008005896
NOTE 40p.; Prepared through the Writing Program Assessment Project.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Freshmen; *Educational Objectives; Higher Education; *Program Attitudes; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; *Writing (Composition); Writing Instruction; *Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS Freshman Composition; Writing Programs

ABSTRACT

A survey was undertaken to gather and record the perceptions that college writing program directors and teachers have of the goals of their writing programs, particularly freshman composition. Responses were returned by 134 writing program directors and 135 composition instructors from publicly or privately funded institutions, two-year colleges, four-year institutions, or universities with substantial graduate programs. A composite list of items was created for each response, which was then coded and keypunched for computer analysis. The results showed only two goals that were mentioned by both program directors and teachers: writing mechanically correct prose and writing coherent prose, both to which were mentioned as real goals and as ideal goals. In addition, directors and teachers perceived these to be goals for their department, their institution, and society at large. While there was a high correspondence between societal goals and real goals on the issue of writing mechanically correct prose, no such relationship appeared on the issue of writing coherent prose. The results indicated differences between the directors' and instructors' perceptions, suggesting that any attempt to evaluate freshman writing programs must begin by addressing those different perceptions of real and ideal program goals for their departments, institutions, and society. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

WRITING PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PROJECT
Technical Report Number 5

ED216395

THE GOALS OF FRESHMAN WRITING PROGRAMS AS PERCEIVED BY A NATIONAL SAMPLE OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY WRITING PROGRAM DIRECTORS AND TEACHERS

Stephen P. Witte
Roger D. Cherry
Paul R. Meyer

CS206969

Jointly Funded by The Fund for The Improvement of Post-Secondary Education and The University of Texas

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 5
FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
GRANT NO. G008005896

THE GOALS OF FRESHMAN WRITING PROGRAMS AS PERCEIVED BY A NATIONAL SAMPLE OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY WRITING PROGRAM DIRECTORS AND TEACHERS

Stephen P. Witte
Roger D. Cherry and Paul R. Meyer

Writing Program Assessment Project
GRG 106-A
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712
January 31, 1982

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, with supplemental support from The University of Texas at Austin. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education or The University of Texas at Austin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents i

CHAPTER I: THE NATURE OF THE SURVEY 1

I.1. Introduction 1

I.2. Sample Selection and Distribution 2

I.3. Procedures for Coding the Discursive Statements 4

CHAPTER II: REAL AND IDEAL GOALS OF FRESHMAN WRITING PROGRAMS 5

II.1. Real Goals According to Teachers and Directors 5

II.2. Ideal Goals According to Teachers and Directors 10

II.3. Relation of Real and Ideal Goals 14

CHAPTER III: DIRECTORS' AND TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF DEPARTMENTS', INSTITUTIONS', AND SOCIETY'S GOALS FOR FRESHMAN WRITING PROGRAMS 19

III.1. Perceptions of Departmental Goals for Freshman Writing Programs 19

III.2. Perceptions of Institutional Goals for Freshman Writing Programs 22

III.3. Perceptions of Society's Goals for Freshman Writing Programs 26

CHAPTER IV: SUMMARY 29

APPENDIX 1: Schools of Responding Directors 31

APPENDIX 2: Schools of Responding Teachers 35

NOTES 37

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF THE SURVEY

I. 1. INTRODUCTION

This survey was undertaken in order to gather and record the perceptions that college writing program directors and teachers have of the goals of college writing programs, particularly freshman composition (see note 1).

The present report is divided into four major sections or chapters. The present chapter introduces the entire report and focuses primarily on descriptions of the procedures used for collecting data about the goals of freshman composition programs, the sample population whose responses we report, and the procedures used in performing content analyses of the written responses. The second section presents the views that writing program directors and teachers have of the real goals and the ideal goals of freshman composition programs, and it explores some of the differences and similarities between the two sets of views. The penultimate chapter reports what both college writing teachers and program directors think their departments, their institutions, and society at large believe the goals of freshman composition to be. The fourth and final chapter offers an interpretative summary of the findings and suggests what they may mean for the teaching and evaluation of freshman composition courses and programs in this country.

Throughout the bulk of the present report we rely heavily on descriptive statistics in order to present composites of the many statements we read about goals of freshman composition programs. We do not use descriptive statistics in order to obscure what is unique or individual in the statements we examined, although neither the unique nor individual is our primary concern in the present report. In most cases we are careful to distinguish among the statements made by teachers and directors from two-year colleges, four-year institutions, and universities.

The statements we analyzed about the goals of freshman writing programs were collected in connection with two other surveys, one a national survey of writing program directors (see note 2) and the other a national survey of college teachers of writing (see note 3). Our interest in the goals of freshman writing programs is the same as our interest in collecting accurate descriptions of college writing programs and of the teaching of writing in American colleges and universities: we anticipate that with these data on the perceived goals of freshman writing programs, we will be better able to provide guidance to the profession at large on the evaluation of college writing programs. Accurate descriptions of programs, teaching practices, and goals must, in our judgment, precede informed and useful evaluations of individual programs and courses.

I. 2. SAMPLE SELECTION AND DISTRIBUTION

For the most part, the college writing program directors and the college teachers of writing whose statements we analyzed came from the same persons who responded to our earlier surveys. The principal differences are two: fewer directors and fewer teachers provided written statements about the goals of freshman composition than responded to the earlier surveys, and the written responses analyzed for the present report tended to be less extensive and elaborate than those provided in response to the two previous questionnaires.

Although fewer teachers and directors responded to the goals survey, we still received 239 useable responses, 104 (43.5%) from college writing program directors and 135 (56.5%) from college teachers of writing. (By comparison, 127 responses were analyzed for the earlier directors' survey and 181 responses for the earlier teachers' survey.)

We grouped the responding teachers and writing program directors according to the categories included in two taxonomies used by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to classify institutions of higher learning nationally. The first taxonomy distinguishes between institutions on the basis of primary source of funding--private or public (see note 4). In determining the primary source of funding of the institutions represented by the teachers and directors in our survey, we appealed to several published directories of colleges and universities (see note 5). The second NCES taxonomy allowed us to classify the institutions represented by our sample of teachers and writing program directors as either two-year colleges, four-year institutions, or universities (see note 6). This second NCES taxonomy classifies as universities only those institutions which have substantial graduate programs and professional schools (e.g., school of medicine, school of law, school of dentistry) associated with them. Because we used this second taxonomy, several institutions represented in our sample which carry the name "university" are not so classified by us. Our use of the NCES taxonomies does not indicate our agreement with them, but rather our desire to make clear, consistent, and useful distinctions. In addition, by using the NCES taxonomies, we are better able to determine how well our sample represents the national population of colleges and universities.

The distribution of the 239 responding college writing program directors and college teachers across types of institutions is presented in Table I.1 and Table I.2.

Inst. Type	Private	%	Public	%	Total	%
2-year Colleges	1	1.0	10	9.6	11	10.6
4-Year Institutions	27	25.9	29	27.9	56	53.8
Universities	10	9.6	27	26.0	37	35.6
All	38	36.5	66	63.5	104	100.0

Table I.1. Distribution of Responding Directors by Number and Percentage Across Type of Institution and Principal Source of Funding (N=104).

Inst. Type	Private	%	Public	%	Total	%
2-Year Colleges	2	1.5	12	8.9	14	10.4
4-Year Institutions	31	23.0	39	28.9	70	51.9
Universities	18	13.3	33	24.4	51	37.7
All	51	37.8	84	62.2	135	100.0

Table I.2. Distribution of Responding Teachers by Number and Percentage Across Type of Institution and Principal Source of Funding (N=135).

Table I.1 shows that of the 104 responding writing program directors, 38 (36.5%) direct programs in private institutions, and 66 (63.5%) direct programs in public ones. The majority (53.8%) of the 104 directors hail from four-year institutions, while 37 (35.6%) direct programs at universities and 11 (10.6%) direct programs at two-year colleges. As Table I.2 shows, the 135 responding teachers are similarly distributed across the different types of institutions: 51 (37.8%) and 84 (62.2%) teachers come from private and public schools, respectively; and 14 (10.4%), 70 (51.9%), and 51 (37.7%) teach in two-year colleges, four-year institutions, and universities, respectively. As was pointed out in two previous reports, the distribution of neither teachers nor directors reflects national distributions (see note 7). In both cases, two-year colleges are underrepresented in our sample and universities are overrepresented. (The colleges and universities of the program directors who responded to our goals survey appear in Appendix 1. The colleges and universities of the teachers are listed in Appendix 2.)

I. 3. PROCEDURES FOR CODING THE DISCURSIVE STATEMENTS

Each of the responding directors and each of the responding teachers answered a series of open-ended questions about their perceptions of the goals of freshman writing programs. In order to analyze these discursive responses, we carefully developed and applied a coding system. The analyses of the discursive responses began when one of the investigators read approximately 20 teacher responses and 20 director responses which were evenly distributed across private and public institutions. Although the samples contained about an equal number of responses from directors and teachers from both four-year institutions and universities, somewhat fewer responses from two-year colleges were included in the subsample because such a relatively small number from that group were available. As these prose statements were read, the investigator wrote down a brief summary statement of each recognizable goal included in each response to the various questions about the goals of freshman writing programs.

After the statements from the 40 respondents were so analyzed for content, the investigator constructed a composite list of items for each question asked. In order for an item to appear on one of these composite lists, it had to have been named on at least four (10% of the subsample) respondents' questionnaires. These composite lists were converted into coding sheets, one for each question. The coding sheet for each question on goals contained not only the responses which had appeared on at least 10% of the questionnaires included in the subsample, but also a number of spaces where coders could write in responses not encountered during the reading of the subsample. Two investigators coded the 239 discursive responses for each question onto the coding sheets, and two other investigators checked the completed coding sheets against the discursive statements to be certain they accurately reflected the content of each statement. Subsequently, the coded responses of each director and teacher were keypunched for computer analysis. The following chapters present the results of these analyses.

CHAPTER II

REAL AND IDEAL GOALS OF FRESHMAN WRITING PROGRAMS

The goals that writing program directors and teachers set for freshman writing courses and programs influence both the nature of the curriculum taught and the methods used to teach that curriculum. In addition, the goals espoused for freshman writing programs and courses serve to identify the kinds of things students are expected to be able to do and the kinds of things they are expected to know upon completion of the course or program.

The present chapter is divided into three sections. In the first section, we report on what the responding teachers and directors cite as their real goals for freshman writing programs. In the next section, we examine their statements of the ideal goals for freshman writing programs. In the third section, we look at the relationship between the directors' and teachers' perceptions of real and ideal goals.

II. 1. REAL GOALS ACCORDING TO TEACHERS AND DIRECTORS

In this and the following section, we report on both the real or actual goals and the desired or ideal goals that writing program directors and teachers have for freshman writing programs. These two distinctions--between teachers and directors and between real and ideal goals--allow us to identify important differences in the ways the goals of freshman writing programs are perceived.

The directors' and teachers' responses to our question about the real goals of freshman writing programs are summarized in Table II.1 and Table II.2. The first column in these two tables lists the most frequently cited real goals by directors and teachers. The goals themselves are rank-ordered according to the frequency of their occurrence in the responses of the writing program directors. The four remaining columns in the two tables indicate, respectively, the percentage of responding directors and teachers in all institutions, in two-year colleges, in four-year institutions, and in universities who cited the particular goal in their discursive statements.

Real Goals	Responding Directors All (N=104)	2-Year (N=11)	4-Year (N=56)	Univ (N=37)
write mechanically correct prose	69.2	54.5	78.6	59.5
write coherent prose	54.8	63.6	50.0	59.5
explore topic adequately	48.1	36.4	57.1	37.8
write in various modes	39.4	18.2	48.2	32.4
understand one's composing process	33.7	9.1	28.6	48.6
write syntactically fluent prose	33.7	45.5	25.0	40.5
write for various purposes	27.9	27.3	30.4	24.3
write for various audiences	26.9	18.2	26.8	29.7
understand rhetorical situations	26.0	18.2	26.8	27.0
read critically and insightfully	22.1	36.4	14.3	29.7
write in a plain style	18.3	18.2	16.1	21.6
use principles of good paragraphing	18.3	9.1	21.4	16.2
evaluate one's own writing	17.3	9.1	16.1	18.9
connect writing and thinking	15.4	18.2	14.3	16.2
write about readings	15.4	27.3	12.5	16.2
know how to revise & edit	7.7	----	7.1	10.8
formulate a thesis	3.8	9.1	3.6	2.7

Table II.1. Percentages of Responding Directors Citing Particular Real Goals for Freshman Composition Programs (N=104).

Real Goals	All (N=135)	Responding Teachers 2-Year (N=14)	4-Year (N=70)	Univ (N=51)
write mechanically correct prose	54.1	50.0	60.0	47.1
write coherent prose	60.7	85.7	60.0	54.9
explore topic adequately	25.9	35.7	31.4	15.7
write in various modes	14.2	----	11.4	21.6
understand one's composing process	16.3	21.4	12.9	19.6
write syntactically fluent prose	5.2	7.1	2.9	7.8
write for various purposes	20.7	28.6	11.4	31.4
write for various audiences	29.6	42.9	18.6	41.2
understand rhetorical situations	12.6	7.1	18.6	5.9
read critically and insightfully	21.5	28.6	18.6	23.5
write in a plain style	10.4	14.3	8.6	11.8
use principles of good paragraphing	23.0	21.4	30.0	13.7
evaluate one's own writing	7.4	----	10.0	5.9
connect writing and thinking	1.5	----	2.9	----
write about readings	3.0	----	4.3	2.0
know how to revise & edit	17.0	7.1	10.0	29.4
formulate a thesis	11.9	21.4	12.9	7.8

Table II.2. Percentages of Responding Teachers Citing Particular Real Goals for Freshman Composition Programs (N=135).

Tables II.1 and II.2 reflect a trend that runs throughout the responses we analyzed. Although both the writing program directors and the teachers were very concerned that students learn to write mechanically correct prose in freshman composition classes, a greater percentage of the responding directors than teachers noted "mechanical correctness" as a goal of freshman composition. Whereas 54.1% of the teachers cited mechanical correctness as an important goal, 69.2% of the directors named it. This difference suggests, of course, that directors are more concerned about the mechanics of written composition than teachers are. But the difference might also be attributed to the greater frequency with which directors encounter complaints from colleagues in their own and other disciplines regarding students' inability to

write with mechanical correctness.

Slightly more important than mechanical correctness for the teachers was that students learn to write "coherent prose." In fact, this goal was the one most frequently mentioned by the teachers (60.7%). By comparison, 54.8% of the directors named this as one of their real goals. Even though the teachers listed "writing coherent prose" somewhat more often than did the writing program directors, the percentages suggest that teaching students to write coherent prose is major goal of freshman composition programs.

For the directors, the most important goal following teaching students to write mechanically correct and coherent prose was teaching students to "explore a topic adequately." As Table II.1 shows, 48.1% of the responding directors considered the teaching of this skill to be a major goal of freshman writing. In contrast, as Table II.2 indicates, only 25.9% of the teachers listed teaching students to explore a topic as a goal.

Whereas the directors gave adequate exploration of a topic rather high priority, the teachers seemed to be more concerned that students learn to "write for different audiences." Although the total percentages for the two groups of respondents were similar (29.6% for teachers and 26.9% for directors), interesting differences emerge across institutional types. In two-year colleges and in universities, for example, the teachers regarded writing for different audiences (and purposes) as more important than did the directors. However, in four-year institutions, the tendency is reversed, with the directors apparently attaching greater importance to these goals than teachers.

For the responding directors, teaching students to write in different "modes" has a higher priority than teaching them to write for different audiences and purposes. As Table II.1 shows, 39.4% of the writing program directors cited teaching students to write in different modes as a goal for freshman composition. In contrast, only 14.2% of the teachers listed it as a goal. Interestingly, the disparity is most pronounced in four-year institutions, where nearly half of the directors (48.2%) suggested that teaching students to write in different modes is a goal of freshman composition classes and where only 11.4% of the teachers did. This large difference between teachers and directors in four-year schools appears to be related to the earlier findings regarding audience and purpose. That is to say, only in four-year institutions did directors name with greater frequency teaching students to write for different audiences and purposes than did teachers. And it is in four-year schools that the greatest differences between the directors and teachers appear with regard to teaching students to write in different modes. We have no ready-to-hand explanation for these findings.

In addition to teaching students to write in different modes, the directors considered three other goals more important than teaching students to write for various audiences. These goals were helping students develop an "understanding of their own composing processes," teaching students to "write syntactically fluent prose," and teaching students to "write for different "purposes."

Understanding one's own composing processes is seen as an important goal by many directors, but by relatively few teachers. Of the directors, 33.7% suggested that arriving at an understanding of one's composing processes is an important goal for freshman composition, whereas only 16.3% of the teachers regarded it as such. It is interesting to note, however, that this tendency is reversed for two-year colleges. That is to say, while only 9.1% of the two-year college directors regarded understanding one's own composing processes as an important goal, 21.4% of the teachers in these colleges consider such self-awareness important.

Just as important as understanding one's composing processes for the directors was teaching students to write syntactically fluent prose. Over one-third (33.7%) of the directors cited syntactic fluency as an important goal. Remarkably, however, only 5.2% of the teachers mentioned teaching students to write syntactically fluent prose as a goal for freshman writing programs.

The responding teachers and directors were in closer agreement on the importance of teaching students to write for different purposes. Of the directors, 27.9% suggested this as a goal for freshman composition, while 20.7% of the teachers did.

Slightly more important than teaching students to write for different purposes for the teachers was that students learn the "principles of good paragraphing." Although both directors and teachers cited teaching paragraphing principles with about the same frequency (23.0% for teachers and 18.3% for directors), the directors listed three other goals with a frequency equal or greater. These were teaching students to "understand rhetorical situations," teaching students to "read critically and insightfully," and teaching students to "write in a plain style."

Over one-fourth of the directors (26.0%) suggested that training students to understand rhetorical situations was an important goal of freshman composition. At first glance, it is somewhat surprising that only 12.6% of the teachers agreed, since a substantially greater percentage of teachers had mentioned writing for different audiences and purposes as worthwhile goals of freshman writing programs (29.6% and 20.7% respectively). These differences are perhaps just differences in terminology; apparently the directors were more inclined to speak of "understanding rhetorical situations," whereas the teachers were more inclined to mention writing for different audiences and purposes as particular aspects of learning to understand rhetorical situations.

Slightly over one-fifth of both directors and teachers (22.1% and 21.5% respectively) agreed that learning to read critically and insightfully should be a goal of freshman composition programs.

In general, then, directors and teachers agree about the kinds of real goals writing programs have. At the same time, however, there are systematic differences in the relative importance of these goals, both between directors and teachers and among members of different types of institutions. There is

no simple explanation for these differences, but the differences seem to be genuine. For example, while directors and teachers are in substantial agreement that coherent prose is an important goal of freshman composition, an even greater percentage of directors feels that writing mechanically correct prose is yet more significant. More directors than teachers (by nearly a 2 to 1 margin) regard exploring a topic adequately, writing in different modes, and understanding one's composing process to be important goals. And a surprisingly greater percentage of directors than teachers (in this case by approximately a 6 to 1 ratio) mentions writing syntactically fluent prose as a worthwhile goal of freshman composition programs.

II. 2. IDEAL GOALS ACCORDING TO TEACHERS AND DIRECTORS

In addition to asking writing program directors and composition teachers about the real goals they had for their freshman writing programs, we also asked them about their ideal goals. With this question, we were trying to find out what would they like to accomplish in their classes if by some miraculous turn of fortune they could operate under ideal conditions. Not surprisingly, many of the goals that were mentioned as real goals also turned up as ideal goals. In fact, many responses to the question about ideal goals consisted merely of "same as real goals." From the frequency of responses in general, it is clear that teachers were rather less inclined than directors to discuss their ideal goals.

Tables II.3 and II.4 below contain the frequencies of the directors' and teachers' responses to the question on the ideal goals of their writing programs. In this section we compare the directors' and teachers' responses to the question on ideal goals. The next section examines the relationship of real goals and ideal goals for both teachers and directors.

Ideal Goals	Responding Directors All (N=104)	2-Year (N=11)	4-Year (N=56)	Univ (N=37)
write coherent prose	33.7	45.5	28.6	37.8
write for different audiences	31.7	27.3	32.1	32.4
write for different purposes	23.1	9.1	26.8	21.6
evaluate one's own writing and the writing of others	21.2	9.1	21.4	24.3
write in a plain style	21.2	18.2	19.6	24.3
write in different modes	20.2	9.1	17.9	27.0
think critically and analytically	20.2	27.3	16.1	24.3
understand one's own composing process	19.2	9.1	17.9	24.3
write with confidence	19.2	18.2	19.6	18.9
write graceful prose	19.2	18.2	14.3	27.0
explore topic adequately	15.4	----	17.9	16.2
value personal experience in writing	15.4	18.2	14.3	16.2
write mechanically correct prose	13.5	63.6	7.1	8.1
know full resources of the language	12.5	9.1	8.9	18.9
use writing as problem-solving activity	10.6	----	8.9	16.2
do research & research papers	4.8	9.1	5.4	2.7
know how to revise & edit	4.8	----	8.1	3.6

Table II.3. Percentages of Directors Citing Particular Ideal Goals (N=104).

Ideal Goals	Responding Teachers All (N=135)	2-Year (N=14)	4-Year (N=70)	Univ (N=51)
write coherent prose	41.5	50.0	48.6	29.4
write for different audiences	20.0	21.4	14.3	27.5
write for different purposes	14.8	14.3	11.4	19.6
evaluate one's writing and the writing of others	11.9	7.1	17.1	5.9
write in a plain style	11.1	7.1	11.4	11.8
write in different modes	11.9	7.1	8.6	17.6
think critically and analytically	10.4	7.1	8.6	13.7
understand one's composing process	9.6	7.1	11.4	7.8
write with confidence	8.1	----	8.6	9.8
write graceful prose	13.3	7.1	14.3	13.7
explore topic adequately	8.1	7.1	7.1	9.8
value personal experience in writing	2.2	7.1	2.9	----
write mechanically correct prose	41.5	35.7	44.3	39.2
know full resources of language	4.4	----	2.9	7.8
use writing as a problem-solving activity	4.4	7.1	4.3	3.9
do research & research papers	14.1	7.1	15.7	17.6
know how to revise & edit	10.4	7.1	10.0	11.8

Table II.4. Percentages of Teachers Citing Particular Ideal Goals (N=135).

As Tables II.3 and II.4 indicate, "writing coherent prose" held a high priority for both directors and teachers. However, teachers tended to cite this ideal goal more often than directors (41.5% and 33.7% respectively).

The teachers considered "writing mechanically correct prose" to be as important as "writing coherent prose." (Both concerns were cited by 41.5% of the teachers). The directors, however, with the notable exception of directors at two-year institutions, had considerably less regard than teachers for mechanical correctness as an ideal goal, with only 13.5% of the directors from two-year colleges citing it.

Nearly as important for the directors as "writing coherent prose" was that students learn to "write for different audiences" (31.7%). Substantially fewer teachers (20.0%), however, cited this concern as an ideal goal. Next in importance for both directors and teachers was that students learn to "write

for various purposes," although once again this concern was mentioned more often by directors than by teachers (23.1% and 14.8% respectively).

There is a high degree of regularity in seven of the ideal goals mentioned by both directors and teachers. Approximately 20% of the directors, as compared to roughly 10% of the teachers, mentioned "evaluating one's writing and the writing of others," "writing in a plain style," "writing in various modes," "thinking critically and analytically," "understanding one's composing processes," "writing with confidence," and "writing graceful prose" as important ideal goals of freshman composition courses.

Despite the striking regularity of these seven responses to our question about ideal goals, important differences are apparent across institutional types for several of the variables. Table II.3 shows, for example, that a substantially higher percentage of directors at universities than at four-year colleges regards learning to "write in various modes" to be an important ideal goal of freshman writing programs (27.0% vs. 17.9%). Similarly, a greater percentage of directors at four-year schools than at two-year schools (17.9% vs. 9.1%) cite this goal.

A corresponding pattern holds for teachers as well, as indicated by Table II.4. A higher percentage of teachers at universities than at either four-year or two-year colleges regards "writing in various modes" to be an important ideal goal of freshman composition.

With regard to "understanding one's own composing processes," a greater percentage of directors at universities than at four-year institutions considers this goal to be an important ideal goal (24.3% vs. 17.9%). And again, a similar difference separates four-year colleges and two-year colleges (17.9% and 9.1% respectively). No such relationship holds for teachers in this case, however.

A greater percentage of teachers than directors cited "knowing how to do research and research papers" as an important ideal goal for freshman composition programs. Of the teachers, 14.1% cited this concern, while it was mentioned by only 4.8% of the directors. A similar relationship holds for "knowing how to revise and edit," with 10.4% of the teachers and 4.8% of the directors noting this ideal goal.

For the responding directors, several ideal goals appear to be more important than "knowing how to do research and research papers" and "knowing how to revise and edit." The directors cited both "exploring topics adequately" and "valuing personal experience in writing" 15.4% of the time, while the teachers mentioned the former only 8.1% of the time and the latter 2.2%.

The directors cited "knowing the full resources of the language" and using writing as a problem-solving activity" more often than the teachers as well. Of the directors, 12.5% cited the former concern and 10.6% the latter, while the teachers mentioned each of these ideal goals only 4.4% of the time.

II. 3. RELATION OF REAL AND IDEAL GOALS

Perhaps the most important reason behind our asking writing program directors and teachers about both their real and ideal goals for freshman composition programs was that such information would enable us to compare the two types of goals. As we noted earlier, many of the real goals reappeared as ideal goals. In fact, two-thirds of the real goals were also cited as ideal goals, including the five most frequently cited real goals--"writing mechanically correct prose," "writing coherent prose," "exploring a topic adequately," "writing in different modes," and "understanding one's composing process."

Making inferences or conclusions based on a comparison of these real and ideal goals is a tricky business. However, reason inclines us to believe that if a particular goal was mentioned only as a real goal (and not as an ideal goal), then the individuals responding to our questionnaire probably felt that this goal was generally met by the program. At the same time, if a particular goal was mentioned both as a real goal and as an ideal goal, then the respondents were probably not as convinced that the goal in question was being met. This reasoning forms the basis for much of the following discussion.

Although many of the goals were cited as both real and ideal goals, there are some important differences in the frequency with which particular goals were cited in each category. For example, 69.2% of the directors cited "mechanical correctness" as a real goal of freshman composition programs, but only 13.5% mentioned it as an ideal goal. These figures might suggest that the directors consider the goal of achieving mechanical correctness to be accomplished rather successfully in freshman composition courses. On the other hand, the figures may indicate that the directors consider mechanical correctness to be a goal that would be superfluous under ideal conditions. That is, ideally, students should not have problems with the mechanics of Standard Written English and, therefore, issues of mechanical correctness would not have to be addressed in freshman composition.

Unlike the writing program directors, teachers tended to view mechanical correctness as both an important real goal and an important ideal goal. "Writing mechanically correct prose" was cited as a real goal by 54.1% of the teachers and as an ideal goal by 41.5%. These figures may suggest that teachers are not as optimistic about whether students in fact achieve greater mechanical proficiency as a result of instruction in freshman composition. Many teachers apparently felt there would be a need for instruction in mechanics even under ideal conditions.

Writing program directors and teachers are in closer agreement on "writing coherent prose" as both a real and an ideal goal. Although "writing coherent prose" was mentioned as a real and an ideal goal, approximately 20% fewer directors and teachers cited it as an ideal than cited it as a real goal. There is a much greater difference between real goals and ideal goals concerning the ability to "explore a topic adequately." Considerably fewer directors and teachers cited this goal as an ideal goal than cited it as a real goal; the difference is greater than 17% for teachers and greater than

32% for directors. Since fewer directors and teachers mentioned "exploring a topic adequately" as an ideal goal than mentioned as a real goal, it is possible that both directors and teachers consider this goal to be met in freshman composition.

A similar relationship between real and ideal goals holds for "understanding one's composing process," although the difference in frequency of response between real and ideal goals is not as great as for "exploring a topic adequately." Fewer writing program directors and teachers mentioned "understanding one's composing process" as an ideal goal than cited it as a real goal, suggesting that to some degree these groups consider metacognitive awareness of writing processes to be enhanced as a result of instruction in freshman composition.

Three of the goals mentioned as both real and ideal have to do with understanding rhetorical relationships and appropriate forms of discourse in varied writing situations. For the directors, "writing in various modes" was a very important real goal (39.4% of the directors suggested this was a real goal of freshman composition). Although the percentage of directors who cited "writing in various modes" as an ideal goal was considerably smaller (20.1%), there is still some suggestion that even under ideal circumstances, students would need to improve in their ability to write in various modes.

Recall that, in our discussion of real goals above, we noted that more teachers appeared to be concerned that students learn to write for various audiences and purposes than were concerned that students learn to write in various modes, whereas for the directors the opposite was true. For both directors and teachers, however, the percentages who cited "writing for various audiences" and "writing for various purposes" as real goals are very close to the percentages who cited these goals as ideal goals. For example, 27.9% of the directors and 20.7% of the teachers suggested that "writing for various purposes" was an important real goal, as compared to 23.1% of the directors and 14.8% of the teachers who suggested that "writing for various purposes" was an important ideal goal. These figures may indicate some uncertainty on the part of both directors and teachers as to whether "writing for various purposes" is a realistic goal for freshman composition, and if it is a realistic goal, whether it is realized.

A similar uncertainty attends the goal of training students to write for various audiences. Of the teachers, 29.6% mentioned "writing for different audiences" as a real goal, and 20.0% cited it as an ideal goal, again suggesting some uncertainty about whether "writing for various audiences" should be considerded a real or an ideal goal of freshman composition programs. Indeed, a larger percentage of writing program directors mentioned "writing for various audiences" as an <u>ideal</u> goal than cited it as a <u>real</u> goal (31.7% compared with 26.9%).

Several goals were mentioned by both writing program directors and teachers as real goals, but not as ideal goals. With some caution, we interpret these goals to be ones on which there is agreement as to both their suitability as real goals for freshman composition and their realization in freshman programs. Apparently, neither directors nor teachers saw a need to

mention them as ideal goals.

Oddly enough, however, one of the goals mentioned as a real but not an ideal goal poses a puzzling contradiction with regard to some of our earlier findings. "Understanding rhetorical situations" was mentioned by 26.0% of the directors and by 12.6% of the teachers as a real goal of freshman composition. At first glance, these findings would suggest agreement among a substantial number of directors (and a lesser number of teachers) that "understanding rhetorical situations" is a real goal of freshman writing programs and that, since it was not mentioned as an ideal goal, it is presumably realized in freshman programs. Yet, curiously, our previous results concerning those matters which could be said to be necessary aspects of understanding rhetorical situations-- "writing in various modes," "writing for various purposes," and "writing for various audiences"-- do not support these findings in regard to the more global notion of "understanding rhetorical situations." It is difficult to imagine that, given the uncertainty regarding writing in various modes and for various audiences and purposes which we noted earlier, there could be such agreement regarding the suitability and achievement of the more general goal, "understanding rhetorical situations." How the whole could be accomplished except by accomplishing the various parts remains unclear to us.

Another important objective that appeared as a real goal but not as an ideal goal was "writing syntactically fluent prose." The directors especially considered this goal important; 33.7% cited it as a real goal, as compared to only 5.2% of the teachers. Yet neither group cited "writing syntactically fluent prose" as an ideal goal, suggesting that this goal is successfully accomplished in freshman composition.

Two closely related objectives were mentioned as real goals, but not as ideal goals. "Reading critically and insightfully" was mentioned as a real goal by 22.1% of the writing program directors and by 21.5% of the teachers, and "writing about readings" was cited by 15.4% of the directors and 3.0% of the teachers. Since neither of these goals was mentioned as an ideal goal, there appears to be some agreement that students are able to read more critically and insightfully and are better able to write about what they read as a result of instruction in freshman composition programs.

A final objective that is mentioned as a real goal but not as an ideal goal is "using principles of good paragraphing." Nearly one-fourth (23.0%) of the teachers and 18.3% of the directors cited this objective as a real goal of freshman composition. Again, neither group mentioned "using principles of good paragraphing" as an ideal goal, suggesting that both directors and teachers consider this goal to be realized in freshmen composition.

Those objectives mentioned as real goals but not as ideal goals, when considered as a group, form an interesting set of goals which are apparently considered to be accomplished in freshman composition.

Responses to our questions on real and ideal goals suggest that writing program directors and teachers think that, as a result of instruction in

freshman composition, students are better able to:

1. Write syntactically fluent prose
2. Understand rhetorical situations
3. Read critically and insightfully
4. Use principles of good paragraphing
5. Write about readings assigned for the course
6. Formulate a thesis

Two goals mentioned as both real and ideal were cited with greater frequency as ideal goals than as real goals. Both directors and teachers cited "writing in a plain style" and "evaluating one's own writing" more often as ideal goals than as real goals, suggesting once again some uncertainty as to whether it is realistic to expect these goals to be accomplished in freshman composition.

Several goals, of course, were mentioned as ideal goals but not as real goals. The fact that these goals were mentioned only as ideal goals suggests --somewhat tentatively-- that there is agreement among writing program directors and teachers that these goals could be accomplished only under ideal circumstances. There are some interesting differences, however, between directors and teachers regarding the nature and importance of these ideal goals.

Approximately one-fifth of the writing program directors (20.2%), for example, considered "thinking critically and analytically" to be an ideal goal of freshman composition. Only 10.4% of the teachers agreed, however. An even wider margin separates directors and teachers on two other ideal goals--"writing with confidence" and "valuing personal experience in writing." Nearly one-fifth of the directors (19.2%) suggested that "writing with confidence" was an ideal goal of freshman composition, but only 8.1% of the teachers concurred. And while 15.4% of the directors thought that "valuing personal experience in writing" was an ideal goal, very few teachers (2.2%) were in agreement. Although the gap between directors and teachers is not so pronounced, a similar difference holds for "knowing the full resources of the language," with 12.5% of the directors citing this as an ideal goal, as compared to only 4.4% of the teachers.

There is somewhat more agreement between directors and teachers regarding the ideal goal of "writing graceful prose." Nearly one-fifth of the directors (19.2%) suggested this was an important ideal goal, and 13.3% of the teachers concurred.

Two ideal goals seemed more important for teachers than for directors-- "doing research and research papers" and "knowing how to revise and edit." Of the teachers, 14.1% suggested that "doing research and research papers" was an important ideal goal, while only 4.8% of the directors agreed.

Similarly, 10.4% of the teachers suggested that "knowing how to revise and edit" was an important ideal goal of freshman composition, but once again only 4.8% of the directors were in agreement.

When considered as a group, those goals mentioned only as ideal goals provide an interesting picture of what writing program directors and teachers think would happen in freshman composition under ideal circumstances. The ideal goals emphasized by the directors reflect a concern for "higher-level" cognitive--or in some cases, metacognitive--skills. For example, the directors thought that, ideally, students would be better able to:

1. Think critically and analytically
2. Write with confidence
3. Value personal experience in writing
4. Know the full resources of the language

Teachers, on the other hand, favored two more practical, concrete, "lower-level" skills. Teachers thought that, ideally, students would improve in their ability to: (1) do research and research papers, and (2) know how to revise and edit. The single ideal goal not mentioned as a real goal on which directors and teachers seemed to agree was a matter of style. Both directors and teachers thought that, under ideal circumstances, students would learn to write graceful prose.

CHAPTER III

DIRECTORS' AND TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF DEPARTMENTS', INSTITUTIONS', AND SOCIETY'S GOALS FOR FRESHMAN WRITING PROGRAMS

The present chapter reports on the perceptions that the 239 responding teachers and directors have of their departments', their institutions', and society's views of the goals of freshman writing programs. Accordingly, the chapter contains three main divisions--one each devoted to departmental, institutional, and societal goals for freshman writing programs, as perceived by the responding directors and teachers. The information reported in the present chapter should prove useful in identifying what the teachers and directors perceive as the contextual influences on freshman writing programs.

III. 1. PERCEPTIONS OF DEPARTMENTAL GOALS FOR FRESHMAN WRITING PROGRAMS

Since writing programs play an integral role in most English departments, we considered it important to explore what directors and teachers perceive to be the goals of their departments regarding freshman composition. Are the goals of those who work in freshman composition programs congruent with their perceptions of the department as a whole, or do they consider themselves to be at odds with their colleagues on some points? Furthermore, do directors and teachers have similar perceptions of their departments' goals for freshman composition? Table III.1 and Table III.2 summarize the responses of directors and teachers to the question on perceptions of their departments' goals for freshman composition.

Departmental Goals	Responding Directors All (N=104)	2-Year (N=11)	4-Year (N=56)	Univ (N=37)
produce writers of mechanically correct prose	55.8	54.5	62.5	45.9
produce students who can write coherent prose	26.9	18.2	25.0	32.4
produce students who can do "school writing"	25.0	36.4	25.0	21.6
produce students who can write in other disciplines	21.2	18.2	23.2	18.9
provide adequate service courses for other disciplines	15.4	18.2	14.3	16.2
produce students who can read at the college level	11.5	----	7.1	21.6

Table III.1. What Directors Perceive as Departmental Goals for Freshman Writing Programs (N=104).

Departmental Goals	Responding Teachers All (N=135)	2-Year (N=11)	4-Year (N=70)	Univ (N=51)
produce writers of mechanically correct prose	33.3	28.6	32.9	35.3
produce students who can write coherent prose	17.8	35.7	12.9	19.6
produce students who can do "school writing"	6.7	7.1	8.6	3.9
produce students who can write in other disciplines	10.4	7.1	12.9	7.8
provide adequate service courses for other disciplines	1.5	7.1	1.4	----
produce students who can read at the college level	8.1	----	7.1	11.8

Table III.2. What Teachers Perceive as Departmental Goals for Freshman Writing Programs (N=135).

As Table III.1 and Table III.2 indicate, considerably more directors than teachers think that their department regards mechanical correctness as an important goal of freshman composition. Over half of the directors (55.8%)

think that their department is concerned with mechanical correctness, while only one-third (33.3%) of the teachers share this perception. This difference is consistent with a similar difference between directors and teachers regarding their own real goals. Recall that 69.2% of the directors cited mechanical correctness as an important goal of freshman composition, as compared to 54.1% of the teachers. What is surprising here is not the consistency of differences between directors and teachers, but that both groups are more concerned with mechanical correctness than they perceive other members of their departments to be. Pooling the responses for both directors and teachers reveals that nearly one-fifth (18.4%) of those who cited mechanical correctness as an important goal of freshman composition thought at the same time that it was not considered an important goal by the rest of their department.

The directors perceived the ability to "write coherent texts" to be an important goal of freshman composition for their departments. Although this concern was cited by 26.9% of the directors, substantially fewer teachers had similar perceptions of their department's goals for freshman composition. Of the teachers, 17.0% thought that "writing coherent texts" was an important departmental goal.

As was the case with mechanical correctness, both directors and teachers cited "writing coherent texts" as an important real goal more often than they suggested that this was an important goal for the rest of their department. Of the directors, 54.8% suggested that "writing coherent texts" was an important real goal, but only 26.9% thought their colleagues shared this concern. The disparity is even more striking for teachers, 60.7% of whom cited "writing coherent texts" as a real goal, as compared to only 17.8% who thought their department shared this concern.

Both directors and teachers perceived a number of goals to be important for their departments that they did not cite as important "real" goals for themselves. Surprisingly, several of these goals concern the relationship between freshman composition and other academic disciplines and courses. For example, 25% of the directors suggested that their department was concerned that students improve in their ablity to do "school writing," i.e., examinations and in-class essays. Interestingly, only 6.7% of the teachers shared this perception. Neither directors nor teachers, however, cited this as a real goal of freshman composition programs.

Similarly, 21.2% of the directors (and 10.4% of the teachers) indicated that they thought one of their department's goals was to "produce students who can write in other disciplines." Comments that were categorized under this heading generally suggested that English departments should produce students who could perform not only as competent students but also as competent writers in disciplines other than English. Once again, directors and teachers perceived their departments to be concerned that English departments perform this function, but they had not indicated it as a "real" goal of their own courses or programs.

A substantial percentage of directors (15.4%) and a very small number of teachers (1.5%) suggested that their departments thought it an important goal

to "provide adequate service courses for other disciplines." Comments under this category generally concerned not only offering courses for rather narrowly defined purposes--for example, technical writing or writing for the social sciences--but also suggested that the department's attitude toward writing courses in general should be that such courses exist in order to provide a service to the academic community in general. As with "producing students who can do 'school writing'" and "producing students who can write in other disciplines," directors perceived their departments to be concerned with "providing adequate service courses for other departments" but at the same time had not cited this as an important "real" goal of their composition programs.

Finally, 11.5% of the directors and 8.1% of the teachers perceived their departments to be concerned with "producing students who can read at the college level," a concern that had once again not been mentioned as a real goal by either group.

In general, there is a striking disparity between the "real" goals of freshman composition as cited by writing program directors and teachers and the perceptions of these two groups of the goals of their respective departments. These results suggest that on many issues directors and teachers consider themselves to be somewhat at odds with their colleagues regarding the goals of freshman writing courses. In turn, these differing perceptions may point to a need for greater intra-departmental communication regarding the goals of freshman composition programs.

III. 2. PERCEPTIONS OF INSTITUTIONAL GOALS FOR FRESHMAN WRITING PROGRAMS

In addition to asking writing program directors and teachers about their perceptions of their departments' goals for freshman composition, we also questioned them about their perceptions of the goals of writing instruction in their institutions at large. Once again--as with our inquiry into the directors' and teachers' perceptions of departmental goals--we were interested in whether teachers and directors perceived themselves to be operating with assumptions about the nature and goals of freshman composition that were similar to those they perceived to be held by colleagues within their respective institutions.

Tables III.3 and III.4 below contain the results of our open-ended question asking about the responding directors' and teachers' perceptions of institutional goals for freshman writing programs.

Institutions' Goals	Responding Directors All (N=104)	2-Year (N=11)	4-Year (N=56)	Univ (N=37)
produce writers of mechanically correct prose	68.3	45.5	69.6	73.0
produce students who can do "school writing"	27.9	36.4	21.4	35.1
produce students who can write in other disciplines	22.1	27.3	25.0	16.2
produce students who can write coherent prose	20.2	9.1	16.1	29.7
produce students who can write research papers for non-composition courses	14.4	27.3	14.3	10.8
produce students with developed critical faculties	11.5	----	14.3	10.8
prepare students to do "real-world" writing	10.6	18.2	10.7	8.1

Table III.3. What Directors Perceive as Institutions' Goals for Freshman Writing Programs (N=104).

Institutions' Goals	Responding Teachers All (N=135)	2-Year (N=11)	4-Year (N=70)	Univ (N=51)
produce writers of mechanically correct prose	37.8	28.6	40.0	37.3
produce students who can do "school writing"	17.0	14.3	22.9	9.8
produce students who can write in other disciplines	18.5	7.1	20.0	19.6
produce students who can write coherent prose	21.5	14.3	21.4	23.5
produce students who can write research papers for non-composition courses	15.6	14.3	21.4	7.8
produce students with developed critical faculties	1.5	----	1.4	2.0
prepare students to do "real-world" writing	10.4	21.4	10.0	7.8

Table III.4. What Teachers Perceive as Institutions' Goals for College Writing Programs (N=135).

As Table III.3 and Table III.4 show, "producing writers of mechanically correct prose" once again heads the list of goals perceived to be important for freshman writing courses. A greater percentage of directors than teachers, however, thought that their institutions considered mechanical correctness an important goal of freshman writing instruction (68.3% of the directors, as compared to 33.3% of the teachers). The vast difference which separates directors' and teachers' perceptions of mechanical correctness as an institutional goal for freshman composition is indeed striking. The difference between the directors' and teachers' perceptions is greater at this level than at any other other level examined in the present study--departmental or societal, "real" or "ideal" goals.

A greater percentage of directors (27.9% compared with 17.0% for teachers) also thought that their institutions were concerned with "producing students who could do 'school writing.'" The percentage of directors who saw this goal as important for their institutions was approximately the same as the percentage who perceived it to be important for their departments (27.9% compared with 25.0%, respectively). However, the percentage of teachers who saw "producing students who can do 'school writing'" as an important goal within their departments (6.7%) was substantially lower than the percentage who perceived this to be an important goal of their institutions as a whole (17.0%).

Thus, not only do directors and teachers differ in their perceptions of

the importance of "producing students who can do 'school writing,'" but the teachers themselves apparently consider this goal to be somewhat more important to their institutions than to their respective departments. These results suggest that whereas directors do not perceive a discrepancy between institutions and departments with respect to the goal of "producing students who can do 'school writing,'" teachers perceive a need in institutions at large that is not being addressed by their departments. In short, there appears to be considerable uncertainty regarding the importance of this particular goal.

A similar relationship obtains for the goal of "producing students who can write in other disciplines." The percentage of directors who perceived this as an important goal within their respective departments (21.2%) is very close to the percentage who saw it as important for the entire institution (22.1%). For the teachers, however, the percentage who perceived "producing students who can write in other disciplines" to be a goal of freshman composition within their respective departments (10.4%) was somewhat lower than the percentage who thought this was an important goal for their respective institutions (18.5%).

Once again, there is not only some disagreement between directors and teachers, but a sense on the part of the teachers that there is an institutional need for "producing students who can write in other disciplines" that is not shared by their respective departments.

The percentage of directors who thought "producing students who can write coherent texts" was an important goal of their institutions for freshman composition (20.2%) was over twice as great as the percentage of teachers who cited this goal as important for their respective institutions (8.9%). Once again, the directors perceived a comparable need to realize this goal on both the departmental and institutional levels (26.9% and 20.2%, respectively). The teachers, however, perceived a greater need at the departmental level than at the institutional level (17.8% and 8.9%, respectively). Perhaps the teachers assumed that if freshman composition were to be focused on "producing students who can write coherent texts," then students would necessarily improve in the ability to do "school writing" and in the ability to write in "other disciplines." Our survey, however, does not allow us to verify this speculation.

Both directors and teachers cited with some regularity two goals considered to be important on the institutional level that were not considered important by either group on the departmental level. A comparable percentage of directors and teachers (14.4% and 15.6%, respectively) perceived the goal of "producing students who can do research papers for non-composition courses" to be an important goal of their institutions for freshman programs. This goal was not mentioned at all, however, on the departmental level. This finding suggests, of course, that a fair number of both directors and teachers perceive a need at the institutional level for "producing students who can do research papers for non-composition courses" that is not being addressed at the departmental level.

The directors' and teachers' responses were also in close agreement on

the perceived importance of "preparing students to do 'real world' writing" at the institutional level; this goal was cited by 10.6% of the directors and 10.4% of the teachers. That this goal was not mentioned as a departmental goal suggests that both directors and teachers perceive an institutional goal that is not a departmental goal, and is in turn not reflected in their own "real" goals for composition instruction at the freshman level.

Finally, 11.5% of the directors cited "producing students with developed critical faculties" as an institutional goal of freshman composition. Directors at two-year institutions, however, did not cite this goal at all. Teachers apparently did not share this concern, since only 1.5% cited this goal.

III. 3. PERCEPTIONS OF SOCIETY'S GOALS FOR FRESHMAN WRITING PROGRAMS

In addition to asking the 239 responding teachers and directors for their thoughts on how their departments and institutions perceived the goals of freshman writing programs, we asked them to give us their perceptions of society's goals and expectations for freshman writing prorgams. The responses they gave to our question are summarized in Table III.5 and Table III.6.

Society's Goals	Responding Directors All (N=104)	2-Year (N=11)	4-Year (N=56)	Univ (N=37)
produce writers of mechanically correct prose	72.1	63.6	75.0	70.3
produce students who can write in real-world settings	18.3	36.4	19.6	10.8
produce students who can write college-level prose	14.4	18.2	14.3	13.5
produce culturally literate graduates	10.6	----	5.4	21.6
produce students who can write coherent prose	9.6	9.1	10.7	8.1

Table III.5. What Directors Perceive as Society's Goals for Freshman Writing Programs (N=104).

Society's Goals	Responding Teachers All (N=135)	2-Year (N=14)	4-Year (N=70)	Univ (N=51)
produce writers of mechanically correct prose	51.1	50.0	54.3	47.1
produce students who can write in real-world settings	12.6	35.7	12.9	5.9
produce students who can write college-level prose	7.4	14.3	5.7	7.8
produce culturally literate graduates	2.2	----	2.9	2.0
produce students who can write coherent prose	23.0	28.6	22.9	21.6

Table III.6. What Teachers Perceive as Society's Goals for Freshman Writing Programs (N=135).

As Tables III.5 and III.6 indicate, both writing program directors and teachers think that the most important goal of college writing programs in the eyes of society at large is that students develop mechanical proficiency. Once again, as in our examination of directors' and teachers' perceptions of departmental and institutional goals for freshman composition, directors are apparently more sensitive to this issue than teachers. Nearly three-fourths (72.1%) of the directors and approximately half (50.1%) of the teachers suggested that one of society's goals for writing instruction was that students learn to write with mechanical correctness. It is interesting to note that a greater percentage of directors at four-year institutions (75.0%) and at universities (70.3%) than at two-year schools (63.6%) feels that mechanics is an important concern for our society. No such relationship is apparent for teachers.

In the directors' eyes, society's second most important concern is that college writing programs "produce students who can write in real-world settings." This goal was cited by 18.3% of the directors and by 12.6% of the teachers. Interestingly, a greater percentage of both directors and teachers at two-year institutions than at either four-year colleges or universities thought that society was concerned that freshman writing programs train students to write in real-world settings.

College teachers of writing differ with directors in their perceptions society's second most important concern (following mechanics) for college writing programs. Teachers perceive that society would like to see college writing programs "produce students who can write coherent prose." Nearly one-fourth (23.0%) of the teachers, but only 9.6% of the directors, suggested that society was concerned with this objective.

Taken collectively, the responses of writing program directors and teachers on these three goals which they perceived to be important to society--"producing writers of mechanically correct prose," "producing students who can write in real-world settings," and "producing students who can write coherent prose"--lead us to make the following observations:

First, writing program directors and teachers at two-year schools appear to have a more accurate and sophisticated notion of what society expects in terms of real-world writing. This might arise in part because directors and teachers at two-year schools are more sensitive to the relationship between student learning in writing courses and the writing skills necessary in subsequent employment, as reflected in the curricula of two-year schools which often stress the development of skills for particular occupations.

Second, of the two groups who responded to our survey, teachers of college writing appear to have a more accurate and sophisticated sense than writing program directors of what society expects in real-world writing situations. This conclusion is based primarily on the fact that a substantial percentage of teachers suggested that society expects college graduates to be able to "write coherent prose," rather than to be able to "write mechanically correct prose." This difference may be merely terminological. Perhaps teachers of college writing assume that if students write coherent prose" they will be able to write in real-world settings with mechanical proficiency. It is important to consider, however, that what appears to be only a terminological difference might in fact have noticeable impact on the content and structure of college writing programs and courses.

Finally, a slightly greater percentage of directors than teachers suggested that society expects college writing programs to "produce students who can write college-level prose" and to "produce culturally literate graduates." Concerning this latter goal--"producing cultually literate graduates"--it is interesting to note that neither writing program directors nor teachers at two-year institutions suggested that society espoused this as an important goal for college writing programs. In fact, as Table III.5 shows, it was directors at universities (21.6% of whom cited this goal) who were most sensitive to a desire on the part of society at large that college writing programs "produce culturally literate graduates."

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

In the previous chapters we addressed differences and similarities between directors' and teachers' real and ideal goals for freshman composition. In addition, we examined the directors' and teachers' perceptions of departmental, institutional, and societal goals for freshman writing programs. In the present brief chapter, we consider the most important goals collectively.

Only two goals were mentioned by both writing program directors and teachers at all five levels of our survey. "Writing mechanically correct prose" and "writing coherent prose" were mentioned as real goals and as ideal goals; in addition, directors and teachers perceived these to be goals for their department, their institution, and society at large. Table IV.1 displays the responses to these two goals at each level of the survey.

	Real Goals	Ideal Goals	Dept. Goals	Inst. Goals	Soc. Goals
Writing Mech. Correct Prose					
Directors	69.2	13.5	55.8	68.3	72.1
Teachers	54.1	41.5	33.3	37.8	51.1
Writing Coherent Prose					
Directors	54.8	33.7	26.9	20.2	9.6
Teachers	60.7	41.5	17.8	21.5	23.0

Table IV.1 Major Goals of College Writing Programs as Perceived by Writing Program Directors and Teachers.

Table IV.1 enables us to see some important patterns that have perhaps not been easily discerned from our earlier discussions and tables. For example, Table IV.1 shows that as the respondents' point of focus moves from department to society, the percentage of both directors and teachers who perceived "writing mechanically correct prose" as a concern gradually increases. It is also important to note that the percentage of directors and teachers who think that society considers mechanical correctness to be an important goal corresponds very closely to the percentage who consider mechanical correctness an important real goal. Of course, we cannot claim that the nature of the correspondence between real goals and society goals is causal. That is, we cannot say that the tendency of directors and teachers to have as one of their real goals helping students to achieve mechanical

proficiency results from their perception that this goal is important for our society at large. Although there is no justification for claiming a causal connection between societal and real goals, it is revealing that there is a greater correspondence between societal goals and real goals than between either institutional goals and real goals or departmental goals and real goals.

Whereas there is a high correspondence between societal goals and real goals on the issue of "writing mechanically correct prose," no such relationship holds for "writing coherent prose." The percentage of both directors and teachers who perceived "writing coherent prose" to be an important issue for society at large was substantially lower than the percentage of either directors or teachers who cited this concern as a real goal.

Following the pattern for "writing mechanically correct prose," the percentage of teachers who perceived coherent prose to be an imporant concern increases as the respondents' point of focus moves from department to institution to society at large. For directors, however, just the opposite is true. That is, writing program directors perceived "writing coherent prose" to be more important at the departmental level than at the societal level.

An earlier survey of writing done on the job by college educated people (see note 8) suggests that teachers may have a more accurate sense than directors of the importance of "writing coherent prose" to society at large. This earlier survey shows that most people for whom writing functions as a major part of their job have a quite sophisticated understanding of the nature of writing processes and of rhetorical situations.

Throughout our discussion of the results of this survey of the goals of freshman writing programs, we have noted differences between writing program directors and teachers. Our intention in noting these differences has not been to suggest that one group is "right" and the other "wrong" in their perception of any particular goal of instruction in written composition. Instead, we were interested in such differences in order to be able to ask what impact these differences might have on the curricular and instrucional methodologies of different freshman writing programs.

Throughout the present report we have stopped short of arriving at any hard and fast conclusions about the teaching of writing or about writing program evaluation based on the results of our survey of writing program directors and teachers. We have purposely refrained from drawing such conclusions because we feel the data reported herein are best regarded as providing a starting point from which we can begin to formulate pertinent questions regarding the goals of writing programs for the purposes of evaluation. It does seem clear, however, that any attempt to evaluate freshman writing programs must begin by addressing the differing perceptions that freshman writing program directors and teachers have of real and ideal program goals and of society's, their own institution's, and their own department's goals for freshman programs.

APPENDIX 1:

SCHOOLS OF RESPONDING DIRECTORS

Asnuntock Community College
Auburn University
Augsburg College
Baruch College
Beaver College
Boston University
Carnegie-Mellon University
Case Western Reserve University
Central Oregon Community College
City College of New York
City University of New York--
Queens College
City University of New York--York College
Clarke College
College of Mount St. Vincent
College of St. Catherine
College of William and Mary
Cook-Douglass College
De Anza College
Dean Jr. College
Delta College
Eastern Michigan University
Edison Community College
El Centro College
Ferrum College
Franklin and Marshall College
Frostburg State College
Gannon University
Hofstra University
Indiana State University--Evansville
Indiana University
J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College
Kansas State University
Lake Forest College
Lenoir-Rhyne College
Louisiana State University--Shreveport
Loyola Marymount University
Michigan Technological University
Monroe Community College
Murray State College
New York City Technical College
Northwest Nazarene College
Ohio Dominican College
Ohio University
Ohio Wesleyan University
Oklahoma State University
Pepperdine University

Phillips County Community College
Polytechnic Institute of New York
Principia College
Robert Morris College
Rochester Institute of Technology
Rutgers University--Camden College of
  Arts and Sciences
Rutgers University--Livingston College
St. Edward's University
St. Paul's College
St. Peter's College
St. Thomas College
San Francisco State University
Southwestern Oklahoma State University
Spokane Falls Community College
State University of New York at Oneonta
Syracuse University
Texas A&M University
Tulane University
United States Air Force Academy
United States Military Academy
University of Alabama
University of California--Los Angeles
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado
University of Georgia
University of Hartford
University of Houston
University of Illinois--Urbana
University of Iowa
University of Louisville
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota--Duluth
University of Missouri--St. Louis
University of Nebraska--Lincoln
University of Nevada--Los Vegas
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina--Wilmington
University of Pittsburgh
University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown
University of Southern Alabama
University of Southern California
University of Southern Mississippi
University of South Florida
University of Tampa
University of Texas
University of Virginia--Charlottesville
University of Wisconsin--Madison
Upsala College
Virginia Tech
Walla Walla College
West Liberty State College
Wilberforce University

William Jewel College
William Patterson College
Youngstown State University

APPENDIX 2:

SCHOOLS OF RESPONDING TEACHERS

Anna Maria College
Asnuntock Comm. College
Auburn University
Augsburg College
Beaver College
Brigham Young University
California State--Dominguez Hills
Carnegie Mellon University
Central Connecticut State College
City University of New York--
Queens College
Clarke College
College of Mount St. Vincent
College of St. Catherine
College of St. Francis
College of William and Mary
Cook-Douglass College
Dean Jr. College
Delta College
East Central University
Edison Community College
El Centro College
Ferrum College
Franklin and Marshall College
Frostburg State College
Gannon University
Hofstra University
Indiana State University--Evansville
Indiana University
Jefferson Community College
Kansas State University
Lake Forest College
Lewis and Clarke Community College
Los Angeles Trade & Technological College
Louisiana State University--Shreveport
Loyola Marymount University
Miami University (Ohio)
Michigan Technological University
Monroe Community College
Murray State College
NYC Technical College
Nicholls State University
Northwest Nazarene College
Ohio Dominican College
Ohio University
Ohio Wesleyan University

Oklahoma State University
Pennsylvania State--Behrend College
Pepperdine University
Phillips County Community College
Polytechnic Institute of New York
Princeton University
Rochester Institute of Technology
Rutgers University--Camden College of
Arts and Sciences
St. Edward's University
St. Paul's College
St. Peter's College
St. Thomas University
San Francisco State University
Southwestern Oklahoma State University
Spokane Falls Community College
State University of New York at Oneonta
Texas Christian University
Texas Tech University
Tulane University
United States Air Force Academy
University of Alabama
University of California--Los Angeles
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado
University of Georgia
University of Hartford
University of Kentucky
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota--Duluth
University of Missouri at St. Louis
University of Nevada--Las Vegas
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina--Wilmington
University of Pittsburgh
University of Southern California
University of South Florida
University of Southern Mississippi
University of Tampa
University of Virginia--Charlotte
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin--Madison
Upsala College
Virginia Tech
West Liberty State College
Wichita State University
William Patterson College
Youngstown State University

[1]The authors wish to thank a number of individuals for their contributions to the present report. Lester Faigley, Thomas Miller, Anna Skinner, and Chris Benton assisted in the development of the questionnaire used to elicit responses from the teachers and directors. Anna Skinner also assisted with the coding of the discursive responses. Janice Sturrock somehow managed to keep track of the questionnaires as they arrived at our office. Clare Alesch and Kermit Campbell helped us in preparing the data for computer analysis and in constructing some of the tables included in the report. Rebecca Francis did more than a secretary should have to do to see that our work went smoothly—giving of her time, sometimes after hours, making sure that results were tabled legibly and sensibly, and offering her sage advice when advice was needed.

[2]Stephen P. Witte, Paul R. Meyer, Thomas P. Miller, and Lester Faigley A National Survey of College and University Writing Program Directors, Technical Report No. 2 (Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Writing Program Assessment Project, 1981). ERIC Doc. No. ED 210 709

[3]Stephen P. Witte, Paul R. Meyer, and Thomas P. Miller, A National Survey of College Teachers of Writing, Technical Report No. 4 (Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Writing Program Assessment Project, 1982).

[4]Nancy B. Dearman, The Condition of Education: Statistical Report (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1980), and W. Vance Grant and Leo J. Eiden, Digest of Education Statistics (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1980).

[5]David B. Biesel, et al., eds., The College Blue Book: Narrative Descriptions, 17th ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1979); Susan F. Watts and John Hunter, eds., Patterson's Annual Guide to Undergraduate Study, 1980 Edition (Princeton, NJ: Paterson's Guides, 1979); James Cass and Max Birnbaum, Comparative Guide to American Colleges, 9th ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1979); and Maureen Matheson, ed., The College Handbook, 1980-81 (New York: College Examination Board, 1980).

[6]Grant and Eidon, Digest of Education Statistics.

[7]A National Survey of College and University Writing Program Directors and A National Survey of College Teachers of Writing.

[8]Lester Faigley, Thomas P. Miller, Paul R. Meyer, and Stephen P. Witte, Writing After College: A Stratified Survey of the Writing of College-Trained People, Technical Report No.1, (Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Writing Program Assessment Project, 1982). ERIC Doc. No. ED 210 708